

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY



From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY
EXAMINING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 66)

To:

Takanashi Norimichi

**No.602, FUJI BLDG., 2-3,
Marunouchi 3 cho me ,
Chiyoda-ku, TOKYO, 100-0005,
JAPAN**

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

27. 7. 2004

Applicant's or agent's file reference

CFO17665WO

REPLY DUE

within **2 months** from
the above date of mailing

International application No.

PCT/JP03 /12978

International filing date (day/month/year)

09.10.2003

Priority date (day/month/year)

30.10.2002

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Int.Cl. **H05B33/04, H05B33/14, H05B33/22**

Applicant

CANON KABUSHIKI KAISHA

1. ☐ The written opinion established by the International Searching Authority:
☐ is ☐ is not
considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This first (first, etc.) opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
 - ☐ Box No. II Priority
 - ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
 - ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
 - ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
 - ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(c).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary report on patentability
(Chapter II of the PCT) must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: **28.02.2005**

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/JP

Japan Patent Office

3-4-3, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8915, Japan

Authorized officer

Hiroshi Yamamura

Telephone No. +81-3-3581-1101 Ext. 3271

2V 3208

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP 03 / 12978

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

- ☐ This opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:
- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
 - ☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
 - ☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of (*replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."*):

- ☒ the international application as originally filed/furnished
- ☐ the description:
- pages _____ as originally filed/furnished
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☐ the claims:
- pages _____ as originally filed/furnished
- pages _____ as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☐ the drawings:
- pages _____ as originally filed/furnished
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
- ☐ the sequence listing (specify): _____
- ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify): _____

4. ☐ This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
- ☐ the sequence listing (specify): _____
- ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify): _____

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP03 / 12978

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1 - 3</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	_____	YES
	Claims	<u>1 - 3</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1 - 3</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO

2. Citations and explanations

Document 1 : U S 2002/0036462 A (Hirano)
2002.03.28

Document 2 : JP 2000-277253 A (CANON KABUSHIKI KAISHA)
2000.10.16

Document 3 : JP 2002-203682 A (Yamazaki et. al.)
2002.05.16

The subject matters of claim 1 and 2 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of the document 1 and 2 cited in the ISR.

While the document 1 discloses a display device comprising a display region having a plurality of organic light emitting elements disposed on a substrate, doesn't disclose the technical feature that "a second insulating protective layer is provided between the flattening insulating film and the substrate" and "a surface on a side opposite to a substrate side of the display region are covered with an insulating protective film", both of which are indicated in the claims.

However, the document 2 (see especially [0004]-[0022] and Fig2) discloses an organic electroluminescent device having an insulating protective layer located on the substrate and its entire periphery is covered with an insulating protective film in order to suppress penetration of water and oxygen from contacting atmosphere.

Therefore, the skilled person in the art would easily conceive the subject matters of claim 1 and 2 by adding the insulating protective layer and the insulating protective film to the display disclosed in the document 1.

The subject matter of claim 3 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of the document 1, 2 and 3 cited in the ISR.

The document 1 doesn't disclose the technical feature that "element-separating portion covering layer is provided between the element-separating portion and the organic layer".

However, the document 3 (see especially [0090] and Fig.8) discloses an organic light emitting display having element-separating portions covered with gas-insulating film.

Therefore, the skilled person in the art would easily conceive the subject matter of claim 3 by element-separating portions covered with the gas-insulating films instead of the element-separating portions in the display disclosed in the document 1.